

Date: Sat, 22 May 93 04:30:21 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #160
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 22 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 160

Today's Topics:

 Put up or Shut up!
 Restructuring the Amateur Radio Service

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 21 May 1993 22:52:51 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Put up or Shut up!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

William=E.=Newkirk%Pubs%GenAv.Mlb@ns14.cca.CR.rockwell.COM writes:

>it would be possible to do a bad job on the replaceable parameters questions
>such that every test generated would have to be checked to see that the test
>generator didn't come up with a set of values that were incorrect or
>accidentally made 2 right answers...

Well it's always possible to do a bad job programming (and some people do
it regularly ;-). But certainly it would not be that difficult to come up
with a program that generated "correct" tests. There are several
shareware/PD software packages available already that do something similar
to this for studying other material.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: 21 May 93 16:17:29
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!malgudi.oar.net!caen!
rphroy!link.ph.gmr.com!vbreault@ames.arpa
Subject: Restructuring the Amateur Radio Service
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <gerde.738006825@moon.ecn.purdue.edu> gerde@moon.ecn.purdue.edu
(Carlyle Gerde) writes:

Carlyle made a good start. I like most of it.

<stuff deleted>

What I would propose is a total of four (4) classes, four (4) exams
(to include code) and a license structure that focuses an upward
path. We now have three code elements: 1a - 5wpm, 1b - 13wpm and
1c - 21wpm. Why not just Element 1, a 50 character per minute (cpm)
(10 wpm) test? Keep Element 2 but combine Elements 3a & 3b back
together (Element 3). Do the same for Elements 4a & 4b. These
(Elements 3 and 4) are now much harder tests.

<stuff deleted>

This is simple. Is it acceptable?

73... N9NWO

Well... It is indeed simple, and I like simplicity. It presents a
reasonable challenge, and I like that too. It also reduces the
importance of Morse code. I've been a proponent of that idea for
quite some time now.

The FCC currently requires a demonstrated ability in only one mode.
As a result (in my opinion) there are thousands of operators that
are proficient in that one mode, to the total exclusion of other
very good modes. I would like to see Carlyles idea modified to
require a demonstrated ability in one mode, but one mode from a
list of contemporary modes. I believe that, given a choice, some
applicants would choose a more modern mode and, having studied it
for the license, would be quite likely to use it on the air.

Naturally, access to the frequencies below 30 MHz would be limited
to those that have demonstrated the ability to "send and receive
Morse code".

--

Val Breault - N80EF - vbreault@gmr.com \ /|

Instrumentation dept GM NAO R&D Center \ / |
My opinions are not necessarily those of \ /--|
GMR nor of the General Motors Corporation \ / |___

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #160
